DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 398 182 SP 036 790

AUTHOR Adkins, Karen R.; Oakes, Phyllis B.
TITLE Inside the Kentucky Teacher Intern Program: Impressions of the Participants.
PUB DATE [95]
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teacher Induction; *Beginning Teachers; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Internship Programs; Pilot Projects; Program Effectiveness; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Interns; *Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS *Kentucky Beginning Teacher Internship Program

ABSTRACT

This document reports on a survey designed to: (1) investigate the findings of a 1988 study on the Kentucky Teacher Intern Program (KTIP); (2) find out if the KTIP still suffers from the problems identified in that study; and (3) examine the reason the program has been changed and a new pilot program initiated. The study data indicated that the KTIP does not still suffer from the ills listed in 1988. While in 1988 a major concern was that many resource teachers assigned were not within the intern's school, 73 percent of the 15 respondents in the current study had resource teachers within their school. However, the majority of the respondents felt there were topics missing from their education and did not consider themselves well prepared; only one of the 15 expressed complete satisfaction with the program. The majority of the interns rated the resource teacher, feedback, and time spent with them as the most helpful part of the KTIP. The new pilot program has the same basic structure and timeline as the earlier program, but, based on the student findings that the observation instrument was no longer applicable to their classes and experience, the observation instrument has been changed in the pilot program and the student portfolio aligned with these standards. The survey instrument and data and lists of interns' comments are appended. (ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Oakes
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 398 182

INSIDE THE KENTUCKY TEACHER INTERN PROGRAM: IMPRESSIONS OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Karen R. Adkins and Phyllis B. Oakes

Introduction

In 1984, the state legislature mandated that all first year teachers in Kentucky participate and successfully complete an intern program before they could be fully certified professionals. The Kentucky Beginning Teacher Internship Program became effective on January 1, 1985.

A study on the effectiveness of the program with 91 interns in the western part of the state was conducted in the 1987-88 school year. The data indicated that while the new program was working well, there were some problems. The interns worried that their resource teacher was not assigned soon enough. In addition, if the resource teacher assigned did not teach in the same building, it presented obstacles to working closely together. Interns also felt that having to take the time to spend fifty hours with the resource teacher outside of the classroom was sometimes a great burden (Hulick & Malone, 1988).

The Hulick and Malone study, **The Kentucky Beginning Teacher Internship Program: A Preliminary Evaluation**, is the only one recorded in ERIC documents evaluating the program since its inception in 1985. The Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP) evaluation instrument was recently extensively modified and a pilot project using the instrument was carried out in the 1994-95 school year.

The intern year experiences of the first author, an intern in the academic year 1988-89, validate the concerns mentioned in the Hulick and Malone study. She was curious about how the intern program is currently working. Does it still suffer from the deficiencies described in 1988?

SP036790

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The research study described in this paper addresses these issues.

The preface of Guiding and Assessing Teacher Effectiveness: A Handbook for Training Kentucky Teacher Internship Program Committee Members affirms that "Kentucky has been in the lead with its Teacher Internship Program since 1985" (Brennan, 1994, p. vii). This statement might lead one to believe that Kentucky was the only state to have such a program in place or had developed one that was extremely unique. However, a 1986 study reported that there were state mandates for intern year programs in California, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Florida (Johnston & James, 1986).

Huston documented the history of the intern program in his paper, **A Study of the Induction of 300 First-Year Teachers and Their Mentors, 1989-1990**. He found that although recognition of the unmet needs of beginning teachers has appeared in the professional literature for decades, prior to 1980, comprehensive programs to meet these needs were located primarily in other countries such as Great Britain and Australia.

Accounts of isolated efforts to assist novice teachers during the past 50 years indicated that only a few were evaluated. Informal practices rather than systematic programs based on identified needs seemed to be the general rule. In 1981 Florida was the sole state with a mandated induction program. By 1989, at least 31 states had either implemented or were piloting or planning some type of comprehensive support system for first-year teachers (Huston et al, 1990).

The rationale for intern programs vary. Some research indicates that the most important concerns of beginning teachers are managing behavior, the feeling of isolation, assessing pupil's work, and finding appropriate materials to use (Varah, 1985). Other research found that the problems were

"methods, doing well in the eyes of the administration, and communication in the school social setting" (Huston et al, 1990, p. 3). Compiling a list of the issues leads one to the conclusion that a first year teacher needs support in the profession according to his/her needs, which vary from one intern to the next.

One commonality in the different states' programs is the membership of the intern program committee. All programs feature a committee that includes support members for the benefit of the intern.

In Oklahoma, the Entry Year Assistance Committee is made up of a peer teacher consultant, an administrator in the school, and a teacher educator from an institution of higher education" (Marks, 1989). This program is the most like Kentucky's. The committee meets three times with the entry year teacher. The intern is observed 2 times. The observation instrument deals with the areas of (1) human relations (2) teaching and assessment (3) classroom management, and (4) professionalism. The instrument lists behaviors and asks the observer to list strengths, concerns, and recommendations in a narrative form. The teacher consultant must spend at least 72 hours assisting and observing the entry year teacher and receives a stipend of $500. The committee must recommend either certification at the end of the intern year or participation in the program for a second year. At the end of the second year, the teacher must be recommended for certification or noncertification. The committee also makes recommendations for a staff development plan that is based on the classroom observations. The stated purpose of the committee is "providing guidance and assistance to the licensed first year teacher, and specifically to assist the teacher in all areas of classroom management" (Marks, 1989, p.5).

Other programs are similar but contain different features. For example, the very structured and complex Kansas Internship Program also includes a committee, but the mentor is a retired teacher. A three-year study was carried out to define the behaviors that were identified as being desirable in the teaching profession. "Three major validity studies, more than any other state has done, were done to validate the use of the behaviors for beginning teachers in Kansas" (Burry, 1989, p.25). The finalized set make up the behaviors used in the Kansas Intern Assessment Inventory. These behaviors are addressed in three phases: (1) self and organization (2) teaching tasks and learning process, and (3) impact and prior knowledge. These phases are sequential and must be mastered. If an intern is assessed at below level, he/she enters an assessment assistance cycle (Burry, 1989). Interviews revealed that 89% of the intern teachers chose "positive" or "very positive" about the program" in responding to questions about the internship program (Burry, 1989).

In the Wisconsin Improvement Program implemented by the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, the committee is comprised of a mentor teacher, an administrator, and a faculty member from a department of education at the University. According to the study done by Varah (1985), during the spring semester of the academic year 1985-86, a teacher assistant would be added to this committee. He/she would be assigned to the mentor teacher as a student teacher to assume some of the tasks of the mentor teacher. This would free the mentor to spend more time with the intern. The university offers an orientation and training program for mentor teachers along with graduate courses designed to assist them in their duties (Varah, 1985).

Also, only the college faculty member and the mentor work directly with the intern. The principal consults with the mentor and college consultant, thereby preserving the connection between the principal and intern as strictly job related. In other words, the principal is not a direct part of the support team. The evaluation process of the intern is thereby kept separate from the support system.

The program at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater has been recognized by many organizations as being outstanding. In 1985, it received the Showcase for Excellence award that was sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the Wisconsin Association of Teacher Educators in 1984. In addition, the Educational Testing Service stated that the program was selected as one of 20 exemplary programs in the nation (Varah, 1985).

In September, 1991, the Scarborough School Area 10 in Ontario, Canada began a program called the "New Teacher Support Committee" (Hale, 1992). An "orientation buddy" is assigned to every first year teacher. The buddy supports the first-year teacher in whatever realm help is needed. The principals support the program and stated that some of the benefits of the program were that it "gave the new teachers a sense of security, promoted friendships, increased communication between staff, avoided errors in routine matters", and that the "new teacher worked through administration much easier and with less pain" (Hale, 1992, p. 35). The first year teachers suggested that in the future mentors should undergo more training so that their obligations are clear. This mentoring program is very loosely structured, e.g., no scheduled observations were mentioned. One intern described the "buddy" program as a "legitimate, organized, rational approach to getting

through the first year experience with dignity and a sense of growth and accomplishment" (Hale, 1992, p. 28).

Background

Even though only one study has been done on the Kentucky Teacher Intern Program (KTIP) since its beginning in 1985, there are documents that explain and define the purpose and procedures. Handbook for the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program was published by the Division of Testing and Internship, Office of Teacher Education and Certification, Education Professional Standards Board, and the Kentucky Department of Education in July 1993. A previous handbook, Kentucky Teacher Internship Program: Handbook for Teacher Interns and Teacher Internship Committees was published in July, 1990. 1985. The new pilot also has a handbook titled Guiding and Assessing Teacher Effectiveness (May, 1994). A review of the manuals indicates that the basic structure of the program has remained the same.

In the 1993 manual, the stated goal of KTIP is "to increase the likelihood that new teachers will experience success during their first year in the classroom. The focus of the program is on the productive teaching behaviors and the elimination of counterproductive behaviors" (Handbook for the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program, 1993, p. 2).

As of Fall 1994, the KTIP committee consisted of the intern, an administrator, a resource teacher, and a teacher educator. The resource teacher spends a minimum of 70 hours working with the intern and is paid a stipend of $1000. This committee meets four times according to a timeline set forth in the handbook. At the initial meeting an orientation to the program, is conducted and a discussion is held concerning the Professional Development Plan (PDP) and portfolio. A classroom observation must be done by all members

before the second meeting. At that time the observations are discussed and used to develop the PDP. The portfolio is also initiated. Before the third meeting, a second classroom observation must be done by all members. Again the PDP is addressed and the portfolio is expanded. By the fourth meeting the third observation must be completed; the PDP and portfolio are reviewed. The committee also makes a judgment regarding the completion or noncompletion of the internship year. Recommendation on certification of the teacher is another component related to the judgment made by the committee after completion of the program.

The 1994 manual contains a massive amount of information (196 pages) about the program when compared to the 1993 manual (18 pages). Several changes in the program are noted. The major difference is that the intern observation instrument has been redesigned to align with the New Teacher Standards. These standards were generated as part of the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) of 1990. In addition, the portfolio has been redeveloped to support the intern's ability to successfully demonstrate growth in the New Teacher Standards. A committee was formed in September, 1993, to examine and modify the KTIP to bring it into alignment with all factors of the reform act. Ten percent of the interns in the 94-95 school year used the new system.

In comparing the differences in the two manuals, one observes that the 1994 manual defines more exactly what has to be done and how to do it. The reporting forms are dissimilar because the newer instrument focuses on the specific new teacher standards defined in KERA. One could conclude that the 1993 manual looks only at surface features while the 1994 manual examines its very foundation - the goals and outcomes of the reform.

Procedures

Changes in KTIP were attributed to the new expectations for teachers and students spelled out by KERA. Participants within a system can also assist in developing effective modifications. To deal with the questions about the program brought up by the previous study (Hulick & Malone, 1988) and to examine current personal experiences in the intern program, a study was designed to gather information from the participants within the program to determine if the concerns remained the same. A short survey (Appendix A) and a request for voluntary interviews was sent to all individuals who had been interns in the 1993-94 school year or were currently interns in the 1994-95 school year in Pike County, Kentucky.

The survey requested selected background information such as college attended; type of degree; year graduated; and the location of the resource teacher, administrator, and other committee member. It also asked respondents to rate their KTIP experience on a scale of 1-5, "1" being "poor" and 5 being "fantastic." In addition, they were asked to identify the most helpful and least helpful part of KTIP. The last question was, "If you could change any part of the way you were/were not prepared for this experience in your teacher education program, what would it be?".

Some respondents returned the survey, but did not indicate that they wished to be interviewed or identify themselves. Interns who volunteered for an interview were contacted by telephone. The interviewer gathered information on:

1. examples or clarifications of what the respondents listed for "most" or "least" helpful

2. suggestions for changes in teacher education

3. whether the resource teacher assigned to them was in his/her field

4. his/her reasoning behind the rating of the KTIP experience.

In tallying the responses to the surveys and conducting the interviews, new topics arose and comments were made that indicated a need to seek further information from the resource teachers, principals, or teacher educators of the participants who were interviewed. This design has produced a number of narratives describing perceptions of the program. These perceptions, when compared with the literature and information about KTIP, provide to individuals with a stake in this program an insider's view of how the internship program actually operates.

Outcomes

Surveys and interviews with 15 past and present interns produced some interesting insights. Their background information was varied (Appendix B). The area in which the study was conducted is within the service area of Pikeville College, yet four of the interns graduated from other institutions. The type of degree earned varied within the field of education. Five respondents held multiple degrees. The year of graduation ranged from 1990 to 1994, with two having multiple graduation dates. More respondents (those that provided background information) represented the graduation years of 1991, 1992, & 1993.

Since the Hulick and Malone study in 1988 showed there was a problem with resource teachers not being within the same school, this background information was important (Appendix C). Of the 15 respondents, 11 stated that his/her resource teacher was within his/her school. Only four stated that the resource teacher was outside his/her school. Not all respondents supplied the

year of graduation, so looking at the results by graduation year revealed no definite trend on resource teacher assignment. In fact, the 1991, 1992 graduates had resource teachers at their school, but two of the four graduating in the 1993 year did not and the only 1994 graduate didn't either. None of these four respondents mentioned that having the resource teacher in another school was least helpful. In fact, three of the four made some reference to the resource teacher within the "most helpful" section of the survey. In an interview with the 1994 graduate, the participant stated that he had been given an opportunity to change from a resource teacher outside his school to one inside, but he felt they had already begun a good relationship and he declined. He added the fact that she was very willing and available via the phone for any problems and that he felt extremely well served (personal communication, April 12, 1995).

The instructional supervisor in charge of KTIP at the Pike County Board of Education revealed that no staff member had attended any of the meetings to be trained in the new program, but that they planned to attend training the summer of 1995. Armed with this information, the researcher concluded that none of the interns involved in this study were in the pilot program. Therefore, survey respondents were referring to the old KTIP and not the pilot. The data contained in their comments may explain or validate the planned changes in the program.

The interns' comments on the "most helpful" part of KTIP were very closely related (Appendix D). It is the one section of the survey that all 15 respondents completed. The resource teacher was connected in some manner to all comments made except two. Five of the 15 simply said that the resource teacher was the most helpful. Three went on to clarify that by identifying

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the feedback from the resource teacher as most helpful. Another intern added that the feedback from "his informal observations was helpful because there was less pressure and he helped me with mistakes" (personal communication, April 3, 1995). One respondent cited the support and encouragement given from the resource teacher and another stated that "the hours spent ...[were] an invaluable experience" (personal communication, March 7, 1995). The only two who didn't directly mention the resource teacher had comments pertaining to learning questioning techniques and observations that focused on teaching strategies. One intern stated, "My resource teacher was an experienced and knowledgeable librarian. She saved me!" (personal communication, March 22, 1995). Another defined the resource teacher as "someone to pat me on the back and give encouragement" (personal communication, April 11, 1995). An interview with a resource teacher confirmed what the interns had mentioned in their comments. When asked what she thought was the most helpful part of the KTIP, she quickly replied, "Having somebody to answer their questions and that will come to them!" (personal communication, April 8, 1995).

The committee conferences were mentioned as well. According to one intern, "This helped me gain insights in becoming a better educator" (personal communication, March 6, 1995). A Pikeville College faculty member also agreed that the meetings are helpful because they provide the intern with "feedback from the committee that lets them know what they are doing well and what they need to do to improve" (personal communication, April 20, 1995).

Only 12 of the respondents answered the section that asked for a comment on what was the "least helpful". One wrote "nothing". Three mentioned the observation form. Even one resource teacher agreed saying "using the silly observation form that doesn't fit what's being taught--P.E.!" (personal

communication, April 8, 1995). One intern made the statement that "the coding instrument itself did not truly take into consideration the types of activities I normally am involved in" (personal communication, March 7, 1995).

Three also mentioned problems with the meetings with the college member of the committee. "The third member of my committee ... was hard to deal with and resentful of having to drive out to my school (personal communication, March 12, 1995). Only one of the three identified the college so the researcher was unable to gain more insight on this issue. In talking with one teacher educator about any problems she saw with the pilot, she mentioned something that may pertain to the above comments. The teacher educator stated that in the old program it was possible to visit three interns, conduct observations, and hold three committee meetings in one day. With the new program, it takes much longer and each visit with an intern now takes a minimum of half a day. She stated, "It's bad and it's good. It's hard to find so much time when I have anywhere from five-seven interns spread out in anywhere from five-seven interns spread out in Pike, Knott, and Morgan county, but I am finding that I am getting to know the interns much better and that has to be good for them" (personal communication, April 20, 1995). She and a middle school principal commented on the most helpful part of the new KTIP. They both stated that the evaluation process was much better and that it focused on the good instead of "zeroing in on the ineffective teaching behaviors" (personal communication, April 20, 1995). Also in reference to the committee, a faculty member stated "the committee is only as good or strong as the chairperson, the principal. When I'm in a school and they aren't doing what they should, it falls apart. I guess I need to get a little

more aggressive and push, but I'm always uneasy about upsetting our relationship within the school" (personal communication, April 20, 1995).

The few other comments made about the least helpful part of KTIP were scattered over several topics. Two felt that the portfolio was too much paperwork. Another made the remark that "the program was not designed for the resource room setting" (personal communication, April 19, 1995). This was most likely in reference to the observation instrument. One intern felt it was to her disadvantage that she did not have "the students' full cooperation when a KTIP evaluation was being performed" because she concluded that "this created a lot of stress which progressed into being least helpful" (personal communication, March 10, 1995). One faculty member mentioned something not brought up by the interns, but which was alluded to in the 1988 study. She stated that "if the student was very well prepared, then the number of hours required could turn into a burden", but if they were not, then the hours were helpful (personal communication, April 20, 1995).

When the comments were tallied concerning proposed changes in the teacher education program, the most common themes were KTIP and KERA (Appendix F). Only one secondary biology teacher, who graduated from Pikeville College, said, "I received great preparation in college. My education professors really helped me to be ready" (personal communication, March 7, 1995).

Others were not so complimentary and added that they needed "more classes on primary vs. the traditional lecture type" (personal communication, April 12, 1995). Another respondent felt similarly and stated "I feel I was prepared for the teacher directed style of teaching required by the KTIP instrument. However, KERA classrooms don't always look like or operate like that" (personal communication, March 9, 1995.

On the theme of KTIP, one of the interns noted "Since my education degree was from out of state, KTIP wasn't mentioned. It wasn't ever mentioned in my master's program either. I was shocked when I learned I had to do an internship" (personal communication, March 13, 1995). Surprisingly, the previous comment was made by an intern who received her master's degree at the University of Kentucky in 1993. Another intern suggested that "preservice teachers need to use the KTIP in college courses more often" (personal communication, March 23, 1995). During an interview with a Pikeville College faculty member, this issue came up. She stated that "if she were teaching the course, "Classroom Management", she would definitely make some changes in the way it was presented". However, she teaches all Special Education courses, but even so she concluded that she now "adds a section on The New Teacher Standards and KTIP" (personal communication, April 20, 1995). The other comments covered multiple topics such as requiring a longer student teaching period, making a better connection with area schools and including this information within the classes, and portfolio training. The last comment did not clarify whether it was addressing student or teacher portfolios.

When asked to rate their overall KTIP experience, all 15 respondents complied (Appendix C). Three rated it as "satisfactory", 10 as "good", and two as "fantastic". Three interns that rated the experience as "good" made suggestions as to what would have made it "fantastic". According to one respondent, it would have been better if "professional development for interns had been provided according to what turned up in the committee feedback" and "extra help in what content was important" (personal communication, April 12, 1995). Another stated that her experience would have been fantastic "if only

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

her principal had carried his weight on the paperwork" (personal communication, April 14, 1995). A secondary education math intern felt that she needed "someone to tell her exactly what content to cover in her courses. They never would be specific" (personal communication, April 14, 1995). To summarize, all the interns rated their KTIP experience in the satisfactory range indicating that the program is successful.

Conclusions

This study was designed to investigate the findings of the 1988 study, to find out if it still suffers from the problems identified in the study, and to examine the reason the program has been changed and a new pilot program initiated.

The first concern addressed in 1988 was the fact that many resource teachers assigned were not within the intern's school. That was not true for the interns in this study. Seventy-three percent of the interns had resource teachers within their school while twenty-seven percent did not. Considering that those who did not made no comment about the fact being a problem on the survey, it can be concluded that not having a resource teacher in the intern's school is not a problem at this time in the particular area where the study was conducted. However, just because the interns surveyed for this study did not indicate a problem with resource teachers not being in the same school, one can not generalize that this availability of resource teachers is the same within all of Kentucky.

According to Hulick and Malone (1988), the resource teacher is the most important member of the committee" (1988, p. 4). Personal experience with not having had a resource teacher within the school provides her with a perception that a readily available resource teacher is critical to the success of the

intern. Studies that include a larger group that is representative of the whole state should be carried out before it can be stated that not having ready access to a resource teacher is no longer a problem in KTIP.

There were two other concerns voiced in the 1988 study, but which were not addressed in the current study. None of the interns mentioned late assignment of a resource teacher or the fact that the 50 hours spent with the resource teacher were burdensome. The lone individual that mentioned the 50 hours was a faculty member who indicated that she felt that fifty hours spent with the intern might be too much only if the intern was very well prepared.

According to the intern's comments for change within the teacher education program, the majority felt there were topics missing from their education and did not consider themselves well prepared. Only one of the fifteen expressed complete satisfaction with her program.

The majority of the interns rated the resource teacher, feedback, and time spent with them as the most helpful part of KTIP. This certainly disputes the idea presented in the 1988 study that the time spent with the resource teacher is a problem that needs addressing.

Using the data collected in this study, the assumption can be made that the KTIP does not still suffer from the ills listed in 1988. However, since a pilot has been developed with changes of items not mentioned as concerns in 1988, such as the evaluation instrument, it can be assumed that it has evolved beyond them.

When examining the 1994 manual for KTIP, one finds the basic structure of the program and timeline for events to occur is essentially the same. The most significant difference is the change in the observation instrument itself. The new observation instrument focuses upon expected behaviors that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are derived from The New Teacher Standards. The portfolio has also been aligned with these standards, thereby influencing the types of documentation to be included. One of the major complaints found with the program in this study was the use of the old observation instrument. Interns stated that it did not fit the settings, what was being taught, and how it was being taught. Since interns did not comment on this aspect of the program in 1988, it can be concluded that this is a problem that appears to be connected to the changes brought about by KERA. KERA asks teachers to use an outcome based approach in their classrooms, yet their success in these classrooms was being measured with the old instrument designed to measure behaviors that were no longer appropriate. The new instrument is being piloted now and since no interns in this area were involved in the pilot, this study can not attempt to measure its effectiveness. This is one issue that needs to studied to determine if the changes made will solve the problem created by use of the old evaluation form in a setting it no longer addressed.

Interns also expressed concern over the lack of the preparation for KERA and KTIP in their teacher education classes. The one professor interviewed admitted that she had made some changes to the classes she taught in response to the outcomes in the pilot and would recommend changes to others also to better prepare the students for teaching in a changed profession. The fact that the interns did not all graduate from the same college, yet they all mentioned this lack of preparation, leads to the conclusion that this problem is not just located within the service area of Pikeville College. Distribution of The New Teacher Standards to all education programs should occur and these outcomes should be incorporated within the existing preparation programs. If the programs are designed to meet the requirements

of the internship, then the expectations of the KTIP also need to be addressed and modeled in the preparation program. Changes in the teacher certification program are currently being developed that will ensure these issues will be addressed sometime in the near future. However, it can be recommended that institutions of higher education need to begin now to incorporate KERA and KTIP into their education programs that serve the students who have to enter the internship program if they want to remain effective and current in the field of education.

The Kentucky Teacher Intern Program was rated as successful by one hundred percent of the interns in this study. (See Appendix C) In a study conducted by Marks (1989) of Oklahoma's program, which is very similar to Kentucky's, eighty-eight percent of the participants rated the program as successful. Burry's study (1989) of the Kansas program reported comparable results with eighty-seven of the interns believing that they had profited from the program.

Comments made at the inception of The Kentucky Teacher Intern Program (Johnston & James, 1988) sound true in the state of Kentucky today:

> "The emerging concept of teacher career development contains several new important characteristics. First, teacher career development is now seen to encompass the entire career spectrum beginning with admission to a teacher preparation program and continuing through retirement.
>
> Second, during the various career stages teachers have different personal and professional needs; and, both preparing and employing institutions have a responsibility to help meet these needs. Third, teachers themselves can assist with the career development of other

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

teachers. Fourth, teacher career development is becoming recognized as a valid area of professional study and research" (pp. 2-3).

At present, it can be concluded that the KTIP program is successful. The changes to KTIP appear justified by this study. Constant evaluation, however, needs to be conducted to ensure the program continues to meet the needs of the population it was designed to serve.

APPENDIX A

3-1-95

Dear Colleague,

I am conducting a research project on the KTIP program in cooperation with MSU for a requirement on my Rank 1. I am interested in studying participant's experiences in the KTIP program. This study will benefit future interns and your experience in the program is a valuable resource. Please take a few moments to fill out the questionnaire and return it in the self addressed envelope. All comments will be confidential. I am also looking for volunteers to participate in SHORT interviews that will be included in the study. If you are willing to participate, please fill out the information at the end of the form. Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,
Karen R. Adkins

College Attended:
Type of Degree:
Year Graduated:
Check those that apply/applied to your intern committee:

1. Your resource teacher
   _____was_____was not in your school.
2. Your administrator
   _____was_____was not in your school.
3. Your other member was from
   _____the board_____the college_____other
   (please list)_____.
4. You are or have been
   _____enrolled in Intern Year_____enrolled and completed Intern Year_____enrolled in Intern Year for the second year.
5. Please circle the number that best describes your KTIP experience.

1	2	3	4	5
Terrible	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Fantastic

6. What part of the KTIP program was the most helpful?

7. What part of the KTIP program was the least helpful?

8. If you could change any part of the way you were/were not prepared for this experience in you teacher education program, what would it be?

Interview Information
Name:
Phone number to call for appointment: _____day_____evening

Appendix B

Intern's Background Information

College Attended

1	Alice Lloyd
1	Clinch Valley
1	David Lipscomb
5	Pikeville College
2	University of Kentucky
1	Respondent attended 2 colleges
6	Respondents not identifying college

Type of Degree

1	BS	Education
4	BS	Elem Ed (K-4)
1	BS	Biology Sec Ed
1	BS	Eng Sec Ed
1	BA	History Sec Ed
1	BS	Math Sec Ed
1	BA	Political Science Sec Ed
1	BA	Social Studies Sec Ed
2	BS	Spec Ed (LBD) K-12
1	MA	Library Science
5	Respondents hold multiple degrees	
6	Respondents not identifying degree	

Year Graduated

1	1990
2	1991
3	1992
4	1993
1	1994
2	Respondents graduated twice
6	Respondents not identifying year

Appendix C

Committee and Intern Year Information

Resource Teacher

11 was

4 was not in intern's school

Administrator

14 was

1 was not in intern's school

Other member

2 instructional supervisor from the Board

13 college professor

Intern Year

4 currently in internship

10 completed internship

1 unknown

Ratings of KTIP Experience

0 Terrible

0 Poor

3 Satisfactory

10 Good

2 Fantastic

Appendix D

Intern Comments on Most Helpful Part of KTIP

5	Resource teacher
3	Feedback from my resource teacher
1	Conferences with teacher educator and resource teacher
1	Advice from committee members (resource teacher, principal, and teacher educator)
1	Support and encouragement from resource teacher
1	Hours spent with resource teacher
1	Questioning techniques
1	Observations that focused on strategies
1	Conferences with my resource teacher, principal, and teacher educator

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix E

Intern's Comments on Least Helpful Part of KTIP

3	Observation form
3	Meetings with the college member
2	Portfolio too much paperwork
1	Program not designed for resource room setting
1	Nothing
1	Observations done when High School students wouldn't cooperate
1	Committee meetings

Appendix F

Intern's Suggested Changes In Teacher Education Programs

2	More KERA preparation
1	Longer student teaching period
1	Include information about KTIP
1	Need to include more information about schools in the immediate area
1	Well trained in teacher directed classroom, but need more alignment with KERA teaching strategies
1	Need to use parts of KTIP expectations in preservice classes
1	No change as well prepared
1	Portfolio training

References

Brennan, S. (Ed.). (1994). Guiding and Assessing Teacher Effectiveness: A Handbook for Training Kentucky Teacher Internship Program Committee Members. Lexington, KY: Kentucky Dept. of Education.

Burry, J.A. and others. (1989). The Kansas Internship Program Assistance/Assessment Model: A Product of the Interdependence of Research and Practice. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, March, 1989. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED308 222)

Hale, M. (1992). Perceptions of Participants in the Orientation Buddy Program in Area 10. (Research Report #91/92-10). Ontario, Canada: Scarborough Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 356 202 Handbook for the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program. (1993). Lexington, KY: Kentucky Dept. of Education.

Hulick, C., Malone, B.G. (1988). The Kentucky Beginning Teacher Internship Program: A Preliminary Evaluation. Murray State University. Presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 313 327)

Huston, R.W.; and others. (1990). A study of the Induction of 300 First-Year Teachers and Their Mentors, 1989-1990. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 338 558)

Johnston, J. M., James, J. L. (1986). Leadership and Cooperation Through Mentoring: Rethinking Roles in Teacher Education. Memphis State University. Presented at the Association of Teacher Education Summer Workshop, Flagstaff, Arizona. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 649).

Marks, S. (1989). Effects on an Entry-Year Program on a Public School System--Implications for Teacher Induction for the 21st Century. Paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators Mid-America Regional Conference, October, 1989. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317 496).

Varah, L. J. (1985). Teacher Induction Program (An Inservice Program for First-Year Teachers. University of Wisconsin-Whitewater. Presented at the National Council of the States on In-service Education Convention, Denver, Colorado. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 150).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE